DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 328 765 CE 056 972

AUTHOR Phelps, L. Allen; And Others
TITLE The UAW Joint Funds: Opportunities and Dilemmas for Postsecondary Vocational Education.
INSTITUTION National Center for Research in Vocational Education, Berkeley, CA.
SPONS AGENCY Office of Vocational and Adult Education (ED), Washington, DC.
PUB DATE Dec 90
CONTRACT V051A80004-89
NOTE 45p.
AVAILABLE FROM National Center for Research in Vocational Education, Materials Distribution Service, Horrabin Hall 46, Western Illinois University, Macomb, IL 61455 (Order No. MDS-119: $4.50).
PUB TYPE Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142)

EDRS PRICE MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS *Community Colleges; *Educational Philosophy; Educational Practices; Education Work Relationship; Inplant Programs; *Labor Education; Labor Force Development; Program Implementation; *School Business Relationship; Two Year Colleges; *Unions
IDENTIFIERS *Customized Training; *United Auto Workers

ABSTRACT

A study examined the impact that the United Auto Workers' (UAW) Joint Funds programs, established in the early 1980s, have had upon the policies and practices of selected community colleges in the Midwest. Each of the three UAW Joint Funds programs (Ford, General Motors, and Chrysler) offers a wide array of special programs to active and inactive workers. Study data were collected through interviews with college presidents and program representatives, site visits, and reviews of case studies. Information was received from eight community colleges in Illinois and Michigan that had worked closely with the Joint Funds for the past 3 years. The study found that the UAW Joint Funds programs have extended a new model for industrial relations that emphasizes concern for human resource development. The existence of the Joint Funds has enhanced the direct involvement of the community colleges in providing customized training programs and courses. The varied programs provided in the plants also directly reflect and support the broad mission of the community colleges. However, the colleges' broader view of educational planning operated in only a limited way in the programs. The short-term needs or timetables of the programs sometimes conflicted with the community colleges' ability to respond. Little research exists with which to evaluate the programs. Recommendations were made for improving the accountability of the programs. (KC)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED328765

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

P Seidman

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

THE UAW JOINT FUNDS: OPPORTUNITIES AND DILEMMAS FOR POSTSECONDARY VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

L. Allen Phelps
University of Wisconsin

Dale C. Brandenburg
James Jacobs
Industrial Technology Institute

National Center for Research in Vocational Education
University of California, Berkeley
1995 University Avenue, Suite 375
Berkeley, CA 94704

Supported by
The Office of Vocational and Adult Education,
U.S. Department of Education

CE056972

December, 1990

MDS-119

FUNDING INFORMATION

Project Title:	National Center for Research in Vocational Education
Grant Number:	V051A80004-89
Act under which Funds Administered:	Carl D. Perkins Vocational Education Act P.L. 98-524
Source of Grant:	Office of Vocational and Adult Education U.S. Department of Education Washington, DC 20202
Grantee:	The Regents of the University of California National Center for Research in Vocational Education 1995 University Avenue, Suite 375 Berkeley, CA 94704
Director:	Charles S. Benson
Percent of Total Grant Financed by Federal Money:	100%
Dollar Amount of Federal Funds for Grant:	$5,744,000
Disclaimer:	This publication was prepared pursuant to a grant with the Office of Vocational and Adult Education, U.S. Department of Education. Grantees undertaking such projects under government sponsorship are encouraged to express freely their judgement in professional and technical matters. Points of view or opinions do not, therefore, necessarily represent official U.S. Department of Education position or policy.
Discrimination:	Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 states: "No person in the United States shall, on the grounds of race, color, or national origin, be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under any program or activity receiving federal financial assistance." Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972 states: "No person in the United States shall, on the basis of sex, be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under any education program or activity receiving federal financial assistance." Therefore, the National Center for Research in Vocational Education project, like every program or activity receiving financial assistance from the U.S. Department of Education, must be operated in compliance with these laws.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Acknowledgements i

Introduction 1

The Joint Funds and Economic Development Thrusts of the Community College 3

The Origins of the Joint Funds 5

Program Descriptions 7

- UAW-Ford Program 7
- UAW-GM Program 12
- UAW-Chrysler Program 15

Research Questions and Methodology 16

Case Studies 19

- Chicago City-Wide College/Ford Assembly Plant 19
- Danville Area Community College/Central Foundry 21
- Oakland Community College 24
- Henry Ford Community College 25
- Macomb Community College 28

Conclusions 31

Recommendations 35

- Policy Issues 35
- Programmatic Issues 36

References 39

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The authors are indebted to the administrators and instructional staff associated with the Joint Fund programs and community colleges who participated in the study described herein. Their willingness to provide comprehensive and candid information about their programs was greatly appreciated. Our gratitude is also extended to the national directors of each of the UAW Joint Funds for their support of this investigation.

We also wish to thank Dr. Debra Bragg of the University of Illinois, Ms. Lynn Burger of the Illinois Community College Board, and the anonymous reviewers for their thoughtful comments on an earlier version of the technical report.

Finally, we give special acknowledgement to Ms. Rita Fischbach who served as graduate research assistant for this project. Rita's diligent data collection efforts, fresh analytical perspective, and enthusiasm for field work were all instrumental to the completion of the study.

INTRODUCTION

The UAW Joint Funds initiatives represent a distinct difference in collective bargaining agreements of the past and those likely to occur in the future. Under the general framework of collective bargaining, we might consider Joint Funds to be the result of a new thrust in the general area of human resource preparedness and development policies. In part, they have been initiated following pressures from the rapid pace of corporate and workplace reorganization and increasing competition from abroad, especially in the automotive industry.

This report takes a close look at the impact which these Joint Funds programs have had upon the policies and practices of selected community colleges in the Midwest. A clearer understanding of the various training and employee assistance programs which the Joint Funds have established with community colleges will provide insights regarding how the rapidly growing customized training efforts of community colleges have been influenced by the presence of the well-financed Joint Funds. More specifically, the purpose of our study was threefold: (1) to determine how the community colleges became involved with the Joint Funds, (2) to examine the dimensions of these programs, and (3) to assess the nature and extent of impact which these involvements have had upon the college's curriculum offerings, outreach efforts, and student services. Our investigation did not pursue the converse matter—that is, seeking to determine what benefits accrued to the Joint Funds from the community college involvement. While addressing this matter would provide a more comprehensive view of the collaborative relationship between community college vocational-technical education programs and the Joint Funds, access to the data and information needed to address this purpose is limited due to the proprietary interests of the auto manufacturers and the UAW.

The Joint Funds programs were established in the early 1980s following a deep recession in the automotive industry. It would be reasonable to say that both labor and management did not want to go through another similar period.

The Joint Funds initiatives may be seen as a way in which labor and management are experimenting with a new system of industrial relations that is intended to broaden the traditional collective bargaining arena and shift to actions at the strategic and workplace levels. This transformation in industrial relations policies, along with extensive manufacturing restructuring, provided the emphasis and context for the Joint Funds

initiatives. The critical nature of impacts on the workforce during the recession, of 1979 to 1984 is reflected in the 11.5 million workers who lost their jobs due to plant closings, the abolition of a position or shift, or slack work.

From a certain perspective, the UAW Joint Funds initiatives can be seen as a response to corporate and workplace restructuring. These agreements with labor extend and modify employment security commitments to the workforce of the automotive industry. The Joint Funds represent a range of new programs designed to implement these commitments. One distinct aspect of these programs is that they provide assistance to the workforce in acquiring jobs outside a parent firm. Traditionally, this sort of relocation assistance has been provided by state or federal governments, if at all.

Thus, this paper examines how selected postsecondary vocational-technical education programs are being influenced by major changes in the human investment strategies of the American automotive manufacturing industry. It is based on the assumption that training and education programs of American education, and specifically the focus of vocational education, must be responsive to the needs of labor and business. Public educators need to become aware of and react to the changes in the human investment patterns of American manufacturing. This means not only in the programs and course offerings, but in the internal operations of the institutions if effective approaches to addressing these needs are to be developed. This paper depicts how selected community colleges have been influenced by the development of the UAW-automaker Joint Funds.

THE JOINT FUNDS AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT THRUSTS OF THE COMMUNITY COLLEGE

In the initial inception of the Joint Funds programs, it was assumed by both labor and management that institutions possessing specific education and human resource development expertise would be contracted to deliver some of the programs developed by joint management and union teams. While the three programs hired their own national staff "technicians" (i.e., people hired by the funds who were not part of union or management), there were too few staff employed to coordinate all of the activities in the two hundred and fifty automaker facilities scattered throughout the United States. In determining how to implement the programs desired by the Joint Funds, the union and management envisioned community colleges as logical partners in the process. There were many natural advantages to working with the community colleges. First, community colleges were often located in the same communities as the plants. In some of the major midwestern states, there were community colleges within twenty minutes of any major automobile manufacturing facility, which gave them a competitive advantage over other potential training delivery systems.

Second, the community colleges already had developed some sustained ties with several UAW affiliates and other unions. In many instances, community colleges were the sites of the apprenticeship training for plants. In other instances, labor studies programs have been initiated. In addition, under the previously existing "free tuition" programs of the Big Three, many employees had taken courses in community colleges.

Third, the community colleges, as institutions, possess some of the characteristics that the Joint Funds programs had determined were important for successful program delivery. The colleges had a commitment to flexible delivery of instruction. It was common for instructors to teach at night or on weekends and to accommodate the demands of shift work (in many colleges, two sections of a particular class are offered at night and in the morning to accommodate workers who "swing" their work schedules on a regular basis). Instructors in the colleges were aware that many of their students worked full-time, so their curriculum and methods were geared to the adult learner. In general, the colleges were viewed as having an atmosphere in which adult workers felt secure. The adjustment workers would have to postsecondary education would still be present, but it would be easier to make in the community college setting.

All these factors made community colleges a logical partner for the Joint Funds programs. However, the relationships were also driven by some major changes in the mission of community colleges. In the early 1980s, these institutions became actively involved in economic development. Dale Parnell (1990), president of the American Association of Community and Junior Colleges, depicted community colleges as supplying the "missing link of economic development" which he identifies as "systematic attention to human resource policy" (p. 5). Similarly, a recent study of economic development and community colleges concluded that "involvement in economic development activities of a nontraditional nature have opened new vistas and opportunities for community colleges to better meet community needs" (Katsinas & Lacey, 1989, p. 60).

These new education-business relationships went well beyond the typical approach of community colleges to continuing education or community relations. In the early 1980s, many colleges began to develop "business and industry centers" whose express purpose was to offer college courses by contact to industry. In most colleges, these new units were not placed under the vocational or occupational education dean, but, rather, they reported directly to the president as part of the institution's new mission in economic development.

Another factor that contributed to the proliferation of customized training courses and enhanced outreach efforts was the increasingly difficult fiscal situation faced by community colleges in the Midwest. These institutions saw the potential funds to be earned in contracted training as a major source of additional revenue.

The 1979-1982 recession served to intensify and converge these general trends. Throughout the United States, business and industry were faced with international competition that required a major response from a number of educational institutions. From the perspective of the states, the community colleges were viewed as a major retraining arm for the economy. The Governor of Michigan, James Blanchard (1990), described the Michigan community colleges as "the single trainers of adult workers providing flexible programs and support services to non-traditional students and business in the community" (p. 34).

This convergence of economic demands, retraining needs, mission expansion, and financial opportunity created a natural alliance between the Joint Funds and many community colleges in the Midwest.

THE ORIGINS OF THE JOINT FUNDS

The original joint-funded programs in the automobile industry were the result of the 1982 contract negotiations at Ford and General Motors (GM). These negotiations were unique in UAW-Big Three bargaining because they were completed in March of 1982 long before the 1979 contract was to expire in September 1982. These contracts provided major wage concessions from both Ford and GM workers. In large part, this contract was motivated by the impact of the 1979-1982 auto slump which resulted in almost two hundred fifty thousand auto workers on indefinite layoff in early 1980. (For a discussion of this, see Katz [1986]).

In order to make the wage concessions more palatable to the UAW, a number of programs were instituted to improve the job security of workers. Among these programs was a guaranteed income stream for high seniority workers. In truth, management pledged not to close any plants during the first twenty-four months of the agreement because of out-sourcing—the practice of sending work and jobs to subcontractors in the United States and abroad. In addition, management agreed to the establishment of a joint national employee development and training program at each company which was funded by company contributions per worker hour. The original purpose of the funds was to provide counseling, training, and tuition assistance to laid-off and employed workers (Katz, 1986, p. 76). Over time, the Joint Funds moved to a broader focus upon employee assistance that included education, training, and development.

The development of the Joint Funds programs was grounded within both long-term union and management goals in auto negotiation bargaining. For the companies, the belief was that though education and training unit costs would be lower, productivity would be increased, and the result would provide more profitable auto companies. The automakers had already realized some of these gains when they implemented programs in the late 1960s that attempted to deal with drug, alcohol, and other substance abuse programs in the plants. Many of the first management leaders of the Joint Funds came from these earlier substance abuse programs.

From the union side, the establishment of the Joint Funds programs was another step in the long process of winning fringe benefits for its members. Since World War II, the union had successfully negotiated health insurance, better pensions, vacations, and supplementary insurance. The education and training funds, which provided tuition

assistance and retirement counseling, was another vehicle which improved the jobs of its members. This view is important in understanding why many UAW staff members involved in the Joint Funds programs actively resist any attempts to utilize funds for technical training or any in plant management or union workforce development goals. They regard the programs as benefits for all workers to use such as dental insurance and not tied to any "strategy" within the auto industry.

Each fund is a separate corporate entity, which is staffed by company management (usually selected by the company personnel manager), union representatives (selected by the leader of either the Ford, GM, or Chrysler Department), and a number of "technicians" who are hired by the funds to utilize their skills in programs initiated by the funds. All decision making is done jointly by union and management personnel, which means that often union or management teams caucus to develop their respective positions before ideas are presented to their counterparts. While the funds are independent from their companies, in organizational structure and culture, they tend to mirror their parent company and the particular political culture within the specific UAW department.[1] It is important to recognize that because all Joint Funds are negotiated by contract, the funds are generated as a set-aside of hourly wages; the UAW views these funds as "their" money, and not resources to be controlled by management. In general, management personnel agree and often defer to the union interests when conflicts arise.

Finally, it is important to note that the Joint Funds programs do not exist between the automakers and the Canadian Auto Workers Union. Since the CAW rejected concessions and the opening up of their agreements, they have not had joint funded activity. Training and educational programs are part of the management's organizational structure, and some joint technology committees which involve labor representatives exist (see Robertson & Wareham, 1987).

---

[1] The UAW-Ford Joint Fund programs were instituted more rapidly than the others because they were operated within the smaller, more centralized organization, as well as in the presence of a more receptive union leader, Donald Ephlin, who was committed to the concept of "jointness" early on.

PROGRAM DESCRIPTIONS

Each of the three UAW Joint Funds programs offer a wide array of special programs to active and inactive workers. The specific components of each program are determined, in large part, by the corporate culture and the shared views of the Joint Funds mission. In the UAW-Ford program, for example, considerable emphasis is given to local plant autonomy on matters related to employee training and development. While there is a national development and training center for the UAW-Ford programs, it has less influence at the plant level than do the National Centers used by General Motors and Chrysler. Generally, the UAW-GM Program emphasizes skill development and enhancement directly related to technological development, whereas the Ford and Chrysler programs are more focused on the personal education and development needs seen by employees as important. The following program descriptions provide overviews of special insights regarding each of the programs.

UAW-Ford Program

As noted earlier, the UAW Joint Funds were created out of the 1982 Collective Bargaining Agreements with Ford Motor Company and General Motors, Inc. Initial discussions had taken place in 1979, but the Employee Development and Training Program (EDTP) for UAW-Ford was established following the 1982 agreement. This agreement is built on several participatory principles and has many elements similar to previous UAW-Ford joint efforts that emphasize autonomy of the local workforce to meet their perceived needs in areas related to personal growth and long-term job security. These efforts emphasize local committees, voluntary participation by employees, and local program flexibility.

The program is funded under the collective bargaining agreement by contributions from the company and by UAW hourly employees based on the number of hours worked. The policymaking unit of the EDTP is called the Joint Governing Body and is comprised of equal members of Ford management personnel and UAW representatives. It is co-chaired by a Ford vice president and a UAW vice president. This governing body establishes program policy, provides overall guidance, authorizes expenditures of funds, and directs program administration through the UAW-Ford National Education, Development, and

Training Center. The center itself is a not-for-profit legal entity located on the Henry Ford Community College campus in Dearborn, Michigan. Staffing of the center includes both company and union representatives and professionals with backgrounds in education, counseling, training, placement, and information processing.

Under the 1982 Agreement, funding was allocated at the rate of 5¢ per hour worked. The 1984 Agreement increased the rate to 10¢ per hour worked, plus fifty percent for overtime hours exceeding five percent of average straight time hours for the previous twelve-month period. Another 5¢ per hour is contributed through workers' wages. Separate provisions were also made in 1984 for funding health and safety training and local training at an additional 4¢ per hour. It is estimated that under this 1984 Agreement approximately $35-40 million per year is generated under the various negotiated arrangements for employee development and training purposes.

The UAW-Ford Program extends from the National Center through joint local EDTP committees to eighty-five Ford facilities and their surrounding communities throughout the country. The program works closely with local governmental, social, and educational resources. Neither the National Center nor the local plant committee provides any direct educational or training services, but, rather, arranges to have such services delivered by existing local institutions and organizations.

The UAW-Ford collective bargaining agreement charters the program and authorizes the National Center to "promote training, retraining, and development activities and efforts and, in the process, contribute to the competitiveness of the company—aspects which are essential to the job security, personal growth, and development of Ford employees." The specific program objectives include the following:

(1) Provide training, retraining, and developmental opportunities for both active and displaced employees.

(2) Support other local and national UAW-Ford Joint Fund activities.

(3) Provide opportunity for the exchange of ideas and innovations with respect to employee development and training needs.

The following list describes the major kinds of activities or programs that are funded through the UAW-Ford Joint Fund Program (UAW-Ford National Education, Development, and Training Center, 1988). The first set is *for employees who are currently active*.

- *Education Fairs*
  These fairs provide employees with information about services available through the program and through local community resources.

- *Life Education Planning Program*
  This program is designed for individuals or groups to explore personal strengths and interests in ways to increase personal potential through education, training, and other developmental activities.

- *Basic Skills Enhancement Program*
  This program provides educational counseling and learning opportunities for a GED, high school completion, and English as a second language. Generally, these programs provide training on a self-paced and in-plant basis.

- *Education and Training Assistance Plan (ETAP)*
  Generally known as the *Tuition Assistance Plan*, this program provides prepaid tuition and fees up to $1,500 per year for self-selected education and training at approved educational institutions.

- *Personal Development Assistance Feature of ETAP*
  This service provides prepaid assistance up to $1,000 per year for personal development and training opportunities, including non-credit or non-degree courses covering topics like communication skills, computer literacy, and goal setting.

- *Targeted Education Training or Counseling Projects*
  These projects provide special education, technical skills enhancement, counseling, or personal development projects that address the needs of a particular plant location.

- *College and University Options Program (CUOP)*
  This program makes use of the tuition programs in conjunction with various academic support services to make approved college-level education programs more accessible. Program features include workshops to explore education goals, in-plant college classes, and related support services.

- *Successful Retirement Planning Program*
  This program helps senior workers plan the transition to retirement and includes discussions on insurance, pension benefits, and legal and financial planning.

The following programs and activities are devoted to *employees on layoff*:

- *Career Day Conferences*
  These conferences provide workers with information about services available through the UAW-Ford Program and from local community resources.

- *Vocational Plans and Interest Surveys*
  Surveys are conducted to provide information on displaced employees' career plans and interests to assist local committees in planning and developing appropriate activities.

- *Career Counseling and Guidance*
  These services assist individuals in setting personal career goals through group classes and workshops. Basic skills enhancement assists workers on layoff to improve basic skills in math and language communication, prepare for GED, or complete requirements for a high school diploma.

- *National Vocational Retraining Assistance Plan*
  This program provides prepaid tuition and fees of up to $5,000 maximum, depending on seniority, for approved, self-selected education and training at specified educational institutions.

- *Targeted Vocational Retraining Projects*
  These programs provide prepaid technical skills training in high demand occupations.

- *Jobs Search Skills Training*
  These services provide laid-off employees with self-directed job search skills, labor market information, interviewing skills, and professional job search assistance.

- *Relocation Assistance Seminars*
  These seminars provide information on various aspects of relocation such as housing and medical care.

- *Location Assistance Loans*
  This program assists laid-off workers transferring to new jobs more than fifty miles away.

A unique feature of the UAW-Ford Program, as contrasted with the other Joint Funds programs, is the concept of the Life Education Advisor (LEA). LEAs are individuals who are neither union nor Ford employees, but are paid from UAW-Ford Joint Fund money allocated through a special contract with the University of Michigan. LEAs, where applicable, are assigned to a local plant. They operate as a resource person for the local Joint Governing Committee and assist that committee in acquiring resources from the National Center or from other local agencies in the support of the education and training needs of employees for that plant. One of the duties of the LEA is to conduct the Life Education Planning Workshops and provide individual advising sessions for participants.

Other features of the UAW-Ford Program include an Employee Assistance Plan (EAP), which has two separate but parallel objectives to provide UAW-represented employees with confidential assistance in resolving serious personal problems and to help them avoid problems by encouraging workers to take the necessary steps for more productive and useful lives. The kinds of programs offered through the EAP include smoking cessation, nutrition education, exercise education, and stress management education. These programs and services are administered through the Joint Local EAP Committee.

Other programs sponsored by UAW-Ford include the Best in Class Quality Program, which is designed to ensure worker participation in achieving continuous improvement in the quality of Ford products. This program was established in 1987 and is directed by the Joint Quality Improvement Steering Committee. Finally, the Labor Management Studies Program is a joint education effort sponsored by the union and company to enhance fundamental skills necessary to carry out labor management assignments and obligations. This is a leadership course consisting of three, one-week segments, including topics such as future auto industry trends, the impact of technology, and the UAW-Ford bargaining history.

UAW-GM Program

The UAW-GM (General Motors) Joint Fund Program is structured similarly to the UAW-Ford program. While there are some differences, the major funding issues and governance issues are comparable. A national executive board controls the overall programs and activities through their facility in Auburn Hills, Michigan, while local committees operate within the plants. The UAW-GM programs (UAW-GM Human Resource Center, n.d.) include the following:

- *Health and Safety Training*

  For the most part, Health and Safety Training is conducted through the Health and Safety Center located in Madison Heights, Michigan. Its goal is to provide effective training that will help eliminate job related injuries and fatalities. Classes began in September of 1985 and employees from more than one hundred and seventy-one GM facilities have attended programs. Many of the courses offered are concerned with particular equipment such as fork truck operator training, electrical safety, and robotic safety. There is a separate program concerned with hazard communication. In general, most of these programs are taught by UAW members for UAW members.

- *Quality of Work Life Activities*

  This program develops individuals and training activities for preparing in-plant QWL coordinators to run and institute programs locally. Many of the activities are directed toward understanding the value of increased worker participation as a key to GM's survival, but also to develop internal QWL policies at the local plant level. These programs came out of the 1984 National Agreement between UAW and GM. This approach helps to assure that successful processes of the past will be retained and misunderstandings and mistakes will be recognized and avoided.

- *Attendance Recognition Awards and Benefit Entitlement Program*

  The Attendance Recognition Awards encourage better attendance by awarding monetary stipends to employees for achieving perfect attendance. The Benefit Entitlement Program discourages excessive absences by reducing benefits for those who miss work beyond a certain amount.

- *Tuition Assistance Program (TAP)*

  TAP was begun in January of 1984 and allocates up to $5,000 per employee for tuition and fee payments to help employees with enhancing their personal skills toward obtaining better employment opportunities. The program is geared to include employees who are working, as well as those on temporary or indefinite layoff. They can take courses to continue their education, upgrade existing skills, or learn new skills. Individuals can participate in adult education programs or attend trade, vocational, or technical schools or colleges and universities. The most popular individual classes include computer awareness, introduction to robotics, Dale Carnegie, and time management.

- *Paid Educational Leave*

  The Paid Educational Leave (PEL) provides opportunity and resources for individuals to systematically examine and discuss major issues facing the evolving automotive industry and the union. This program establishes a base from which union leaders will be able to identify, analyze, and deal with the challenges of a changing industry. Inaugurated in September 1985, the program provides an analysis of economic, political, and technological forces shaping the current collective bargaining environment. Courses in leadership skills emphasize the importance of strategic planning. Spending time in Detroit, Boston, and Washington, DC, provides participants an opportunity to interact directly with UAW and GM officials, government officials, industry and economic analysts, and a range of experts from leading universities.

- *Retirement Programs*

  The UAW-GM Retirement Programs, similar to those at Ford, are usually conducted at local facilities and include involvement of the worker's spouse. They cover a number of aspects of retirement planning, including legal considerations, health, family and leisure living, and community participation.

- *Joint Skill Development and Training*

  Funded since 1982, this UAW-GM Program represents a major commitment by UAW and GM to provide skill assessment, development, training, and retraining opportunities for all employees. Local committees have been established at each of the approximately one hundred and fifty UAW-represented GM facilities. Committees made up of management and UAW officials provide a comprehensive

training plan based on the needs of the individual facility and workforce. They work with the UAW-GM Human Resource Center in Auburn Hills to receive specialized training in program administration, adult learning concepts, educational planning, and research concepts. Local committees use their training as a base from which to identify the needs of a particular facility. After study, the committee recommends specific education programs and courses to be offered by the center. There are also seven UAW-GM Human Resource Centers located regionally throughout the United States to assist Joint Local Committees. Additionally, the Joint Local Committees can utilize local organizations to provide assistance such as dislocated worker retraining services, job placement, and career counseling, as well as job-specific training. Regional Human Resource Centers are also used for coordination of skill development and training. These centers were originally developed to combat unemployment by providing job placement and training services to dislocated workers. Since 1985, the economic situation has improved so the area centers have shifted emphasis to provide more extensive services for active employees. The area centers provide resource sites for hosting regional communication networks, conducting training sessions, providing consultant services to local in-plant committees, and providing on-site training to in-plant training staff.

UAW-Chrysler Program

The UAW-Chrysler Program, in contrast to the Ford and GM programs, was not instituted until 1985. It is structured similarly to the other two in the sense that there is a national governing council called the Joint Activities Board. The program operates through local committees within the individual plants who are responsible for determining which programs are to be implemented at each site.

The UAW-Chrysler Program has a National Training Center located in Detroit. The programs operated under the UAW-Chrysler agreement include the following:

- Product Quality Improvement
- Salaried Programs
- Advanced Retirement Planning
- National Joint Committee on Health and Safety
- National Attendance Council
- Employee Assistance Program
- Tuition Assistance Program
- Employee Security Systems Programs
- Salaried Workers Employment Security System
- Paid Educational Leave
- Child Care
- Dislocated Worker Assistance Program (UAW-Chrysler National Skill Development and Training Center, 1989)

These programs are, to a considerable extent, analogous in structure and implementation to the Ford and GM programs.

The Joint Activities Board has developed the following objectives for the UAW-Chrysler Program:

(1) To provide more opportunities for employees to participate in decisions affecting their work.

(2) To improve and expand employee job skills so they can meet the demands of new technologies.

(3) To provide employees with the skills and abilities needed to qualify for different kinds of work.

(4) To provide product quality and quality standards through employee involvement, job skill enhancement, and the development of an awareness and understanding of the importance of improving product quality.

(5) To assist employees in identifying and resolving personal problems that interfere with regular work attendance and rewarding those employees who have exemplary attendance records.

(6) To educate workers on how to create safer working environments.

(7) To remove barriers to the full application of skills and abilities such as alcoholism and substance abuse, concerns about child care, or retirement anxiety.

(8) To maximize employment security for both hourly and salaried employees through the development and implementation of employee security systems.

(9) To prepare employees and Chrysler Motors for entry into the twenty-first century.

The Joint Activities Board undertakes a number of duties annually, including establishing policies and guidelines, allocating funds to specific programs and projects, and coordinating the efforts of national committees and councils. Additionally, the board is involved in evaluating and auditing the performance of Joint Fund programs, and integrating these programs with the corporate culture and business decisions model by the corporation.

RESEARCH QUESTIONS AND METHODOLOGY

The general intent of this investigation was to provide a description of the operation of the UAW Joint Funds through two sets of case studies. One set was collected at Illinois sites, a second set at Michigan sites. The locus for information collection was the community college rather than the Joint Funds; thus, primary contacts throughout the study were maintained with community college personnel.

The study methodology employed five activities—initial letters of contact with the Joint Funds, contacts with community college presidents, initial contacts and interviews with community college representatives, site visits, and a review of case studies.

Prior to contact with any community colleges in Illinois or Michigan, letters were written to the co-directors of each of the three UAW Joint Funds centers—at Ford, GM, and Chrysler. The purpose of the letter was to obtain the latest general information about

their program, to tell them about the study, and to ask for a contact person with whom we could work throughout the study.

Based on information obtained from the Joint Funds National Centers, eleven community colleges in Illinois and Michigan were identified for the study, based on the presence of a Ford, GM, or Chrysler plant within their region. There was no attempt to use random selection; rather, the initial choice was to select community colleges where it was likely that Joint Funds were being utilized. A letter was sent to the community college presidents asking for a representative with whom we could obtain primary information for the study.

Once the contact person had been identified at the prospective community colleges, the research team telephoned the designated individual(s). Following the exploratory phone call, a standard protocol was mailed requesting the following information describing their Joint Funds programs and activities:

- Program Announcements
- Contractual Agreements
- Brochures
- Program Listings
- Duration of Programs
- Clients Served

Additionally, three key questions were also included in the request for program information:

- What aspect of the program did you find most difficult to implement?
- What programs did you find most successful for non-traditional students?
- What initial goals of this program for college students were not reached?

Information was received from eight community colleges in Illinois and Michigan that had worked closely with the Joint Funds over the past three years.

Widely varied responses were received from the community college contact persons. In three cases, no responses were received and follow-up calls were made. Some responses revealed that little or no activity with the Joint Funds had occurred, while others were just beginning. In two instances, Joint Funds programs which had begun in 1985 or 1986 had been discontinued due to plant closures. Following its initial round of

data collection, two community colleges in Illinois and three in Michigan were selected to become the major focus of the in-depth data collection. Site visits were conducted by the study investigators and a research assistant. The site visits consisted of initial contact with a community college representative to gather the document information, and then follow up interviews with several key personnel from the college and Joint Fund program to gather further information. Each of the case studies is presented in the following section.

Once the drafts of each case study were completed, they were shared with the community college contact persons and other key informants from each of the five programs. These individuals provided feedback as to the accuracy and completeness of the report. In some instances, plant level Joint Funds personnel also reviewed the case studies and provided reactions. Early drafts of this report (including the case studies) were shared with several state agency and community college officials in Illinois and Michigan. Their comments were helpful in developing additional insights and detailed recommendations.

The purpose of the methodology used was to obtain information on both the number and types of interactions between community colleges and Joint Funds. The major research questions guiding the study were the following:

(1) What is the nature and character of the organizational and philosophical relationships between the Joint Funds programs and the community colleges?

(2) To what extent has collaborative involvement with the Joint Funds programs stimulated new initiatives, organizational changes, curriculum or program revisions, and other noteworthy developments within the colleges?

(3) To what extent have the effects of involvement with the Joint Funds been evaluated and what do these evaluations reveal?

CASE STUDIES

The following case studies provide a general overview of each community college's involvement with the Joint Funds. In some colleges, the programmatic relationships involved both the Ford and GM Joint Funds; in other cases, the programs were focused on a single plant. Since the focus of the study was upon the impact that the Joint Funds programs were having upon the community colleges, we did not seek to evaluate the programs directly. We sought only to describe the changes that were occurring within the programs and services of the community college that were attributable to the presence of the Joint Funds.

It should be noted here that several of these community colleges had programmatic efforts established with the auto manufacturers and/or the unions prior to 1980 (e.g., apprenticeship courses and internships). Thus, it is difficult to assess precisely the independent effects of the Joint Funds.

The information for each of the cases was acquired using several methods. The first phase involved conducting telephone interviews with the contact persons identified by the president of the college. Second, follow-up interviews were held with the contact persons and extensive written information on each of the Joint Funds programs was obtained and reviewed. Finally, on-site visits were made to each of the program sites where program staff, instructors, administrators, and students were interviewed.

Chicago City-Wide College/Ford Assembly Plant

Since 1984, Chicago City-Wide College has been involved in several activities and programs sponsored by the UAW-Ford Joint Fund Program at the Chicago Assembly Plant on the south side of Chicago. Through the College and University Options Program (CUOP) and the Education Training and Assistance Plan (ETAP), more than one hundred and ten credit and non-credit courses have been offered within the plant and off-site. The courses offered have covered a broad range of credit and non-credit offerings, including courses in golf, calligraphy, electronics, small engine repair and maintenance, computer literacy, computer applications (e.g., Autocad), real estate sales and transactions, and psychology. Twelve other educational institutions in addition to City-Wide College have participated in the CUOP at Chicago Assembly in recent years. Community college and

university administrators and faculty have developed a close working relationship with the Life Education Advisor (LEA).

Since 1985, the Business Institute of the Chicago City-Wide College has operated the Skills Enhancement Program (SEP) on a contractual arrangement. Located in the Learning Center, which is situated in the cafeteria complex, SEP provides upgrading in math, reading, and critical thinking skills to UAW-represented Ford employees who are interested. The location of the program makes it very convenient for workers to drop in for brief tutoring or counseling sessions during breaks, before and after working hours, or during their lunch period.

The SEP has a broad set of goals, which include aiding individuals in completing the requirements for a high school diploma or GED, providing English as a second language instruction, providing related academic instruction for credit courses offered in the plant, enabling educational enrichment, helping employees assist their children with homework, and providing general educational counseling and advisement. In addition, the SEP makes available a series of mini-courses (self-instructional modules) in blueprint reading and building technology, which aid workers in acquiring basic skills needed to enter technical education programs and in exploring different career fields. Staff are planning to develop and offer mini-courses in a number of other areas (e.g., basic electronics math and test-taking strategies). In addition to computer terminals, a VCR and other instructional equipment are available for use.

Participation in the SEP is completely voluntary. Special precautions are taken by the counselors and training specialists who staff the program to assure that the content of the personalized instruction programs provided to employees remains confidential.

The SEP is staffed with a full-time instructional coordinator who is responsible for program planning, budgeting, and day-to-day operations, and three training specialists who provide direct instruction. The specialists are employed roughly twenty-four to thirty hours per week. One of the training specialists has a background in teaching English as a second language, while the others have backgrounds in basic skills instruction.

Employees who regularly visit the SEP have a personalized educational development plan prepared for them by a training specialist. The plan is used to guide and monitor the various educational activities undertaken by workers.

When workers enter and leave the Learning Center, they are asked to record the types of services received and the activities they completed during their visit. Bimonthly evaluation reports on the SEP activities are prepared by the Instructional Coordinator and forwarded to the UAW-Ford National Education, Development, and Training Center located in Dearborn, Michigan. SEP staff indicate that in a program such as this with highly varied goals and purposes, it is difficult to develop observable evaluation measures which describe the full impact of the program.

In building and staffing a program such as this, Chicago City-Wide College has had to consider a number of factors. First, it is important to find training specialists who can relate to the plant culture and especially to adults who lack a basic education. Being sensitive to all aspects of adult illiteracy and knowledge of adult learning theory and practice is vitally important. As specialists walk through the plant, they have to seek out and actively nurture the participation of individuals in the SEP. Programs which are successful appear to have staff who can build close, personal relationships and yet maintain effective educational interactions with adults from diverse backgrounds.

Second, staff and administration of programs which run on a voluntary basis must be sensitive to working conditions in the plant; that is, increased overtime and changeover layoffs will decrease attendance and perhaps affect motivation.

Third, training specialists must communicate regularly with the LEA and instructors of other courses being offered in the plant to ensure that specialized assistance is provided in a timely fashion to those individuals who need it. It is vitally important, too, for programs such as the SEP to be strongly supported by the EDTP Committee within the plant.

Danville Area Community College/Central Foundry

Central Foundry opened in 1943 and produces malleable iron products such as exhaust manifolds, transmission parts, and engine parts. Since 1982, the Business and Economic Institute of the Danville Area Community College has been offering courses at the GM Central Foundry plant in Danville. The vast majority of employees enrolling in the non-credit courses have utilized the TAP (Tuition Assistance Plan) funds. The program actually began prior to the initiation of the UAW-GM Joint Fund Program when the community college placed a modular classroom building in the plant parking lot. The initial

interest in updating and improving worker skills at the plant came in the early 1980s as a result of the economic downturn in the automotive industry. Currently, the plant employs fifteen hundred individuals and is a major employer in the community.

The first courses offered were aimed at updating the skills of tradespersons, primarily millwrights and electricians. The courses offered focused on technical skills and new technologies (e.g., programmable controls and hydraulics). As the Joint Fund monies became available, production workers in the plant became increasingly interested in courses from the college. With assistance from the Illinois High Impact Training Services fund, a computer awareness course was developed and offered. Over a period of time, twenty-one IBM XT computers were purchased for instructional purposes and placed in the modular classroom. Over a two-year period, four hundred and forty-eight employees completed the computer awareness course.

Since 1982, a wide variety of courses have been offered at the plant. The most popular courses have included air conditioning/refrigeration, statistical process control, introduction to hydraulics, fundamental electronics, Basic language, analog and digital troubleshooting, introduction to robotics, and vision systems. In recent years, more interest has been placed on courses that are useful to employees outside of the plant such as small engine repair and tune-up, residential wiring, and refrigeration/air conditioning. The courses are offered over a eight to fourteen week period. Typically, they meet for three hours just prior to and following each shift to assure that all employees have access to all courses. In most instances, the courses are taught by either full-time or part-time college faculty. In some instances such as the Robotics course it was necessary for the Institute Director to contract with a vendor company to provide the instruction. In all cases, however, the Director selects individuals who have both an interest and an aptitude for teaching adults. She describes the importance of relating to production workers as essential to the success of the various courses.

Upcoming courses are announced on a regular basis by the in-plant directors of salary training and hourly training. Flyers and other types of announcements are made to all employees regarding DACC courses. The in-plant directors work very closely with the Director of the Business and Economic Institute in planning and recruiting employees for the various courses. Their working relationship can be characterized as one based on mutual trust and respect that has evolved since the establishment of the Joint Fund program.

In part, this positive working relationship is based on the fact that DACC is the only major source of adult and technical education available in the community. Conversely, Central Foundry is a major employer with whom the community college must maintain a productive relationship. The TAP funds have been helped to extend the community service mission of the college and have directly assisted in regional economic development efforts. Based in large part on the success of their non-credit courses at Central Foundry, DACC now offers similar courses to other businesses, many of whom are supplier firms for Central Foundry. As the Business and Economic Institute has grown, the courses at Central Foundry have represented fifteen to twenty-five percent of their operational, cost-recovery budget.

Further, the successful working relationship established in recent years is the basis for planning many other initiatives. DACC is involved in the national UAW-GM program to deliver a financial planning course at GM plants. DACC staff are also assisting GM Central Foundry management personnel in preparing a grant proposal to acquire funds from the State of Illinois to expand and update their in-plant education, training, and communications facilities.

When the modular classroom was purchased, many DACC faculty and administrators expressed deep concern that the college's courses would be reduced in quality and that the on-campus offerings would be reduced. DACC administrators have found that neither is the case. In fact, the Central Foundry courses have led several GM employees to enroll in on-campus courses and degree programs who might not have done so otherwise.

Recently, there has been extensive speculation about the impact of the IRS ruling on taxation of tuition benefits provided by employers. However, DACC administrators have not noticed a decline in enrollment in courses offered at Central Foundry.

Since many changes in manufacturing technology require that workers have excellent skills in reading and mathematics, Central Foundry administrators are concerned about upgrading the basic skills of their workforce. They have begun discussions with DACC administrators about initiating a workplace literacy program which would be offered at the plant.

Oakland Community College

Oakland Community College (OCC) has experience in working with all three of the Joint Funds at both the national and local or plant level. They have worked with the Joint Funds to facilitate retraining, assessment, and placement counseling efforts associated with a plant closure. Additionally, Oakland has developed an in-plant associate degree program for union personnel. The programs operate in fifteen plants located within the OCC service area. Also, customized programs in sophisticated software design are offered in the plants to upgrade and/or retrain employees using tuition assistance programs. Through OCC, the Joint Funds will also offer specialized training programs dealing with specific operations or changes.

To assist in the plant closure, OCC was contracted to hire a staff of eight career counselors, develop and operate an assessment program, and assist laid-off workers in preparing an individual educational development plan. This program was conducted jointly with the Intermediate School District. While the short-term project (four month) appeared to be quite successful in serving over seven hundred individuals, some difficulties were encountered in acquiring access to confidential information on those being laid-off. Comprehensive career planning and counseling after the layoff was problematic in the absence of this information. Once the program was completed all information was destroyed to assure the privacy rights of those who had been served. While these requirements are in keeping with the proprietary nature of the program sponsorship, it is difficult to ascertain the effectiveness and outcomes of these important programs. Maintaining longitudinal information on clients served in these programs would enable the college and the UAW Joint Funds to determine which special programs or services are likely to correlate with successful placement for laid-off workers.

The Associate Degree Program at the Wixom plant focuses on general studies with an orientation toward business. In addition to meeting a significant educational need for personnel at the plant, the college benefits in various ways. Faculty from the college have an opportunity to teach older students, who offer challenges and intangible rewards much different from those associated with on-campus students. Many of the general education courses are taught using illustrations that relate various aspects of the automotive industry. For instance, political science courses have traced the politics associated with invention and proliferation of automotive and other forms of transportation. (This use of in-plant material for course development was adopted following the lead of another community college.) It

was also noted by college administrators that these programs are more successful when the plant-level funds or Joint Funds are available to cover the increased costs of the program (e.g., on-site registration, special assessment programs).

Administrators at Oakland contend that enrollment has increased substantially since the inception of the Tuition Assistance Program (TAP). However, there is no way to know precisely which students enrolled in on-campus classes are having their tuition and fees reimbursed through the Joint Funds. OCC monitors closely the various RFPs that are announced by the national headquarters for the Joint Funds. When an RFP is released for training in a field in which OCC clearly has qualified staff and programmatic expertise, they will consider submitting an application.

Henry Ford Community College

As one might expect from its title, Henry Ford Community College (HFCC) is more closely associated with the UAW-Ford Joint Fund than the others. In fact, the offices of the UAW-Ford National Education, Development, and Training Center are located on their campus. However, they have conducted programs for the other Joint Funds as well.

HFCC administrators noted the importance of understanding the philosophical, developmental, and organizational differences among the Joint Funds. As noted in the introduction, each of the Joint Funds uses committees of management and union personnel to oversee the operation of programs at the corporate and plant level. Beyond that, however, significant differences exist. The use of a Life Education Advisor (LEA) at each plant in the UAW-Ford Program provides a convenient and visible contact person for the college. The three Joint Funds programs also have different procedures for administering their TAP funds, which creates complexities for the college, as well as different philosophies regarding leveraging public funds for use in the Joint Funds programs. GM, for instance, is very interested in acquiring federal and state dislocated worker training funds to assure maximum benefits and resources for employees requiring such training and assistance.

HFCC currently operates three in-plant, associate degree programs. The programs are supported primarily through the TAP funds. The recent IRS ruling which treats tuition

reimbursement as taxable income has significantly reduced enrollment.[2] In many of these programs, HFCC was offering seven to twelve sections of courses and currently the enrollment can be handled in two sections.

The on-site Associate Degree programs offered at three different UAW-Ford locations is designed to promote completion of the Associate of Applied Science degree by skilled tradespersons. Other UAW-represented employees may complete core classes on-site before enrolling in their on-campus program. Generally, students must complete nine credit hours of general education classes (six hours of English and three hours of Social Studies), thirteen hours of elective credits, and two hours of physical education requirements (depending upon the student's age at admission) if they have earned thirty-eight credit hours in their apprenticeship program. Students' basic reading comprehension level, language usage ability, and mathematical skills are assessed to determine if developmental courses are necessary. HFCC recommended offering on-site classes from its curriculum which will transfer to four-year and higher institutions. Consequently, English Composition I and II (or equivalent), Introduction to Psychology, Introduction to Political Science, Principles of Sociology, History of the United States from 1865, and Beginning Algebra are the classes most frequently offered. The college has also been successful with credit and continuing education unit classes which prepare participants to write the National Electrical Code examination for journeyperson or master's licensure.

HFCC has utilized an administrative task force in setting up the in-plant programs. To effectively coordinate the services needed and to keep the administrative costs low, the internal task force appeared to be an essential approach. One administrator noted that the creation of these task forces has helped improve communication and coordination among administrative units on-campus, as well as in working with other business organizations in the delivery of off-campus programs. The task force has included faculty members teaching in the program, developmental education specialists, counseling staff, and personnel from the bookstore and the registrar's office.

The operation of the internal task force is crucial in serving the special needs of individuals who enroll. A developmental class is initiated six weeks before the regular class begins to provide basic skills instruction for those individuals who lack a high school diploma or a GED. Additionally, tradespeople can receive up to thirty-eight hours of credit

---

[2] This IRS policy was rescinded in the Spring of 1990.

for their work experience through an assessment program. A counselor from the college is assigned to the program and works closely with the LEA (Life Education Advisor) in registering students for courses, providing on-site counseling for students, and informally evaluating the progress being made by each student towards the degree. According to one administrator, the use of the internal task force has helped alleviate the administrative difficulties created by new, non-traditional programs such as these.

After assuring faculty members that course content was not to be watered down, interest in teaching at these off-campus locations increased. Many full-time faculty seem quite willing to teach these non-traditional adult students who are, for the most part, highly motivated. In fact, some full-time faculty request that forty percent of their teaching load be in these programs. While the Office of Corporate Training is responsible for the administrative operation of the program, department heads make the determination of instructors for specific courses.

HFCC involvement in Joint Funds programs has also led to some new curriculum development. A six-week course in energy technology was created for GM and taught seven times. Subsequently, credit generating courses have been developed and added to the HFCC catalog. The entire program includes an Associate Degree in Energy Technology that is generally used in preparation for management/technician positions. Four certification programs are also offered: Heating and Cooling, Power/Building Engineer, HVAC Systems Design and Application, and Solar Heating and Cooling.

Involvement in the Joint Funds programs has helped to ascertain and document the need for new, technology-oriented curricula. In the metropolitan Detroit area, the need is significant for technicians in the heating, cooling, and energy technology field, especially in the instrumentation area. One of the major difficulties faced by HFCC is finding qualified faculty. In most of these fields, technicians can earn $50,000 to $100,000 annually; thus there is little interest in becoming a full-time faculty member at a community college. Some administrators at HFCC express deep concern as to whether or not it is reasonable to expect the college to "keep up" with the rapidly advancing high technology applications in various fields.

Macomb Community College

In recent years, Macomb Community College (MCC) has worked primarily with the UAW Joint Fund program at Ford, and more recently Chrysler. The primary connection has been the offering of selected credit courses in which employees can enroll and use the TAP (Tuition Assistance Plan) reimbursement.

To facilitate MCC's involvement in the Joint Funds programs, a new outreach position has been created within the Center for Human Resource Development under the Associate Dean of Education and Training Services at MCC, entitled Industrial Liaison Counselor (ILC). The function of the ILCs is to work closely with selected plant level Joint Funds programs, which entails cooperation with the Life Education Advisor (LEA), and to provide liaison with other plant level groups. In working with LEAs, the ILCs work with other Joint Funds personnel to facilitate student enrollment for MCC courses and programs, and they also provide general advice about other colleges and programs. Three (2.0 FTE) ILCs have been employed since 1985.

The impetus for the creation of the ILCs was some work with Ford in the period of 1985-1988. Assistance was requested by Ford in the redeployment of eighteen hundred workers displaced through plant closings and other reorganization measures. A Reemployment Assistance Model was developed to build upon workers' current skills so that they could move back into Ford in different capacities. A number of things were learned through this process that changed MCC's whole approach to employment assistance; it was also the training ground for the development of the ILC role.

In conjunction with Central Michigan University, MCC has established an Industrial Related Degree Program in three auto plants in the metropolitan Detroit area. This program leads to an Associate degree generally in the areas of business or technology. Essentially, this is a shell program that can be flexibly arranged to meet the needs of a local facility. Partial funding for the program development was provided by the state government under the Michigan Job Training and Retraining Investment Fund (JTRIF).[3]

---

[3] This fund was created in 1982 by the Michigan legislature to provide community colleges with a base of monies for which they would, in turn, solicit matching funds. The intent was for the twenty-nine community colleges in Michigan to become significant contributors to local economic rehabilitation and development. In 1987-88, the state contribution was $4.5 million matched by an additional $8 million contributed by the colleges themselves, Federal funds, foundations, corporations, and cooperating institutions. About one-third of the funds were used to purchase new community college equipment and software; about one-fourth was allocated for personnel salaries; and about one-sixth was spent on local

Full implementation of the Industrial Related Degree Program has been difficult for a number of reasons. Maintaining a critical mass of students has been difficult due to the large number of classes required to maintain a degree program which, in turn, means that flexibility for meeting individual student needs is difficult to accommodate on a continuing basis. Restrictions in the Joint Funds policies regarding the tuition have also created problems. The Joint Funds expect the courses to be provided at the same tuition rate as on-campus courses when administrative overhead costs are higher for these programs (i.e., recruitment costs, on-site registration, and faculty travel costs).

Further, the orientation of the Joint Funds is often to provide only those courses which the autoworkers themselves view as important to their future. This philosophy conflicts directly with MCC's interest in long-term education (i.e., degree programs) where the emphasis is on assuring the student has a sufficiently broad education to deal successfully with future workplace and technology changes. However, none of this work and the relationship with Central Michigan would have been established if it wasn't for the demands and assistance of the Chrysler Corporation.

MCC is currently working with Chrysler on a program which may address some of these philosophical differences. Known as the Life Career Development Program, this initiative will illustrate the opportunities associated with "lifelong learning." Development of the process calls for the employee to examine and diagnose individual strengths and then create a plan for the future with emphasis on meeting education and training requirements. The process is continuing to be developed, and it currently includes special sections for women and another targeted on math skills development. This program would not have been developed without Chrysler's insistence, thus illustrating MCC's responsiveness to its industrial constituents.

Administrators at MCC have watched closely the programs sponsored by the Council for Adult Experiential Learning (CAEL), which are focused on providing college credit for life experiences. CAEL was an initiative explored by the UAW-Ford staff. The UAW-Ford Joint Fund staff saw the federally funded CAEL program as a means to benefit its workers. According to its critics, CAEL assumed a middle class orientation to the development of "portfolios" based upon work experience. Many felt that UAW rank and

---

economic development activities (e.g., seminars, technical assistance). The remaining twenty-five percent was allocated to facility modernization, curriculum development, staff training, and support services. The monies have grown each year from its inception.

file members were not sufficiently prepared to follow its requirements. When UAW-Ford bought into this process, it forced colleges to accept its tenets until it became clear that it was unworkable. In the view of the MCC administrators, there are wide differences among community colleges on the policy and practice of providing credit for skills and technical knowledge acquired through work experience. MCC administrators have not felt confident in adopting the assessment measures advocated by CAEL, and other groups and have been hesitant to undertake this initiative.

The area of opportunity which the MCC administrators view as most important in the next few years is literacy. Literacy in computing skills, basic skills, and technology applications is essential for individuals seeking to advance in educational programs as well as in the workplace. They expressed concern about the complexity and solutions set forth for the literacy issues, as they have observed it being implemented through the Joint Funds programs.

Finally, it was noted that while most of the MCC programs have focused on the Joint Funds and large corporations, a tremendous need exists to offer similar programs to small and medium sized supplier firms. Their view of this problem suggests that it is most efficiently and effectively addressed by working through trade associations representing engineers and technicians in various fields.

CONCLUSIONS

The UAW Joint Funds programs have extended a new model for industrial relations which emphasizes the concern for effective human resource development capacity in the nation's industrial sector (Geber, 1989; Gordus, Gohrband, & Meiland, 1987). Since their formation in the early 1980s, these funds have provided a wide array of development and educational services, ranging from life education planning and location assistance loans to training in job search skills and new technological applications used in the workplace. At Ford, GM, and Chrysler plants throughout the nation, these funds have been used to purchase education, training, and employee assistance from a variety of vendors, including community colleges and postsecondary vocational-technical education centers. In this report, we have examined the impact of these funds upon five community colleges in Illinois and Michigan.

To understand the commonalties and differences between the community college programs and the efforts sponsored by the Joint Funds, one has to examine their individual bases for existence and the markets they strive to serve.

Community colleges, by the nature of their public funding and their mission to serve the educational needs of their constituency, generally follow a programmatic emphasis. By programmatic, we mean that their efforts are to initiate and maintain enrollments in programs, rather than just courses. Generally, they take a long-term view of education in a context that involves curricula leading to degrees and/or some type of occupational certification.

This emphasis implies a process for curriculum development or course development that results in efforts consistent with other efforts and with their mission. To a certain extent, these development efforts are somewhat inefficient in comparison to private training vendor activities which contend they always "customize" to the needs specified by businesses. This development process for community colleges carries over to the delivery structure in that flexibility of offerings has historically not been critical for viability. Offering "in-plant" degree programs is a relatively new effort for community colleges that changes somewhat the administrative structure for enrollment, counseling, teaching, registration, book purchasing, and the like. Such changes come slowly, not without the attached learning curve and the problems of overcoming bureaucratic structures. It should be noted here that the general literature suggests that selected community colleges have been

highly successful in undertaking these programs. (See the "Keeping America Working Partnership Awards Program" reports from the American Association of Community and Junior Colleges/Association of Community College Trustees [1986], Washington, DC.)

The Joint Funds programs tend to view community colleges (and this is the community college perspective as well) as a publicly funded training vendor—no different from a private vendor; it just functions with public funds.

The Joint Funds programs have a different philosophical and market base to contend with than do the community colleges. The Joint Funds programs respond to market needs—primarily those expressed by the UAW membership. What the membership wants, the Joint Funds programs attempt to deliver. Further, they control the costs in the process. These often short-term, market based needs do not generally articulate themselves into educational programs. It may be a lawn mower repair class here, a Dale Carnegie course there, a financial planning course across the street, and a computer literacy class down the road. Some community colleges have trouble responding to these types of needs; they also have trouble responding to cost control measures where customized course development is required. (Generally, this is because these issues run counter to historical educational practice.) They do not have readily available the professional expertise needed for course development, nor can they easily entice faculty members into either the course development or delivery efforts. Furthermore, customized development and delivery cost more than what the Joint Funds are willing to pay.

Thus, inherent conflicts exist between the functions of the two systems. It would be overly simplistic to state that it is just a difference of short-term versus long-term educational vision. Community colleges and the Joint Funds have different views of providing solutions to what they would probably agree is an important, common problem—the need to upgrade the technical and work-related skills of the auto industry workforce. With this perspective in mind, the following conclusions are offered.

First, the existence of the Joint Funds has, in both states, clearly enhanced the direct involvement of the community college in providing customized training programs and courses. As a result of the Joint Funds, many community colleges are now more actively involved in providing courses and related career planning services at plant sites. In both Illinois and Michigan, state agencies have provided funding for workforce training and updating for companies expanding or relocating in the state since the early 1980s.

However, the existence of the Joint Funds has further signaled the community colleges as to the major, unmet needs for workforce retraining and updating that exist among manufacturers in the Midwest. The need and rationale for community college involvement in providing programs designed to enhance economic development initiatives has been clearly demonstrated and reinforced. In some instances, the Joint Funds programs assisted in the early creation of Business and Technology Institutes or Offices for Corporate Training within the community colleges. These units were formed throughout the past decade for the direct purpose of providing customized or contract training and courses related to changing workplace demands. It should be noted, however, that these units were formed to serve other economic development and community service initiatives, not just the Joint Funds.

The varied programs provided in the plants also directly reflect and appropriately support the broad mission of the community college. The programs we observed covered the gamut from adult basic education, to general education, to technical training, to academic transfer courses. The Joint Funds programs each embrace a somewhat different philosophy regarding their mission. However, when viewed collectively the programs represent an opportunity for the community college to provide instruction and services which support some aspect of their broad mission to serve the community. Since many of these plants are major employers within the community college district, administrators and governing boards should view these programs as "indicators" of community needs for similar programs. However, we saw only limited evidence to suggest that this broader view of educational planning was operating at the sites we visited.

Our observations and discussions clearly indicated that in each of the National Centers for Joint Funds administration and at the plants we visited, a wide variety of vendors provided the needed programs and services. Often programs are initiated quickly in response to labor-management committee decisions. If, for instance, a plant is going to be closed for two weeks while being retooled for the coming production year, some Joint Funds committees may be interested in offering several intensive, short-term courses. In these and similar situations, many community colleges appear to have difficulty responding quickly and effectively for a variety of reasons; for example, schedules for courses do not coincide with the academic year calendar, the educational goals of the Joint Funds are unclear or contradictory, or the community college does not have the resources readily available to offer the course or program desired. If community colleges are to be

effective in responding to the Joint Funds, they must have a wide array of resources and services available. Most importantly, they must be able to design programs quickly and flexibly to meet the diverse demands of each Joint Fund initiative.

Within the community colleges we visited, the special institutes or offices responsible for economic development initiatives are often viewed as separate entities and cost centers. In essence, they are required to charge fees at the level which enables them to recover all of the costs associated with courses, seminars, or workshops they provide for the Joint Funds. This "adjunct unit" conception appears to set up several non-productive distinctions in the minds of selected community college personnel. The administrators of these units often view their unit as lower in status when compared to the academic departments or divisions, and as needing to generate considerable revenue to remain in operation. This finding should not be misconstrued as an indication that these separate centers have not been successful in their mission to provide effective, non-traditional instruction addressing the training and skill upgrading needs of their business clients.

The community college and Joint Funds programs we reviewed had each had varied experiences with the federally funded Dislocated Worker Centers (DWCs). It appeared to us that in most situations where these centers were operating at the community colleges, there was little interaction between the DWCs and the college's programs for the Joint Funds. One of the primary reasons appears to be the fact that many autoworkers who are placed on inactive layoff do not meet the income eligibility requirements of the Job Training Partnership Act (JTPA).

The absence of program evaluations and detailed data describing the participation of UAW employees in Joint Funds courses and programs makes it extremely difficult to judge the impact of the programs upon the community colleges and those who are served. The proprietary nature of many of the programs launched by the Joint Funds and the privacy rights of individuals (especially persons participating in basic skills programs) make it extremely difficult to determine answers to such basic questions as who participates in the program and what was their assessment of the instruction. In only a few instances did it appear that course and program evaluation data were being collected by the community college administrators and used in future program planning.

RECOMMENDATIONS

A number of recommendations can be made for improving both policy and practice related to the involvement of the postsecondary vocational education community in employer-union initiated training programs.

Policy Issues

(1) In this study, there were widely discrepant views regarding the use of federal funds to assist in retraining of auto workers who have been placed on indefinite layoff. In some communities, extensive use is made of funds provided under the Dislocated Worker Center provisions of the JTPA (Title III) and the Trade Adjustment Act. Some auto companies have been more aggressive than others in working with legislators and government officials at both the federal and state level to determine how these funds might be tapped to minimize the impact of plant closures or major workforce reductions. As the nation's economy continues to be influenced by global competition, it is vitally important that worker retraining and relocation programs administered by federal and state governments be carefully coordinated across various agencies, including community colleges and postsecondary vocational-technical institutes (Grubb, 1990). Appropriate incentives must be offered to encourage workers affected by layoffs to acquire education and training in occupations which have high demand and offer excellent wages.

(2) In some of the programs we studied, there was clear evidence to suggest that the in-plant programs (both credit and non-credit) and services were considered ancillary to the college's primary missions. While these programs are indeed central to the college's community service mission, they did not, in most cases, appear to be closely linked to the associate degree or certificate programs offered on-campus. As these programs continue to grow in number and in enrollment, they may soon represent a significant portion of the college/institute enrollment, especially in communities with large employers facing retraining difficulties. State and local educational policies should be considered which enhance the status and importance of these programs in the eyes of on-campus faculty and administrators. Additional salary stipends should be offered to regular, full-time faculty to teach in these

programs. State funding formulas could provide a higher level of allocation for these programs than that provided for on-campus degree programs. Awards for outstanding instructors and students in these programs might be presented annually by colleges/institutes. Such efforts would clearly document the importance of these programs to the nation's economic productivity and clearly suggest that the campus-based degree and certificate programs should likewise be more responsive to workplace trends.

(3) Representatives of the Joint Funds at the national and local levels should be invited to serve on community college/technical institute governing boards, advisory groups, and special task forces. Such involvement may provide a better insight regarding the operational dilemmas of postsecondary institutions and potentially can make institutional policies and programs more responsive to the needs of major employers and unions.

(4) In our interviews with community college staff, they were often unsure of how decisions were made by the Joint Funds committees regarding the selection of training vendors or the stoppage of a program. From their perspective, it appeared as though the treatment of vendors was an afterthought, which stands in contrast to how the auto companies are developing sustained ties with their suppliers based on certification of quality programs. It might be useful for the Joint Funds to introduce a similar "certification" program with their community college vendors.

Programmatic Issues

(1) Many of the two-year colleges/institutes throughout the United States have developed offices or institutes directly responsible for business and economic development, technology transfer, or industrial/customized training. Among the five programs we studied, the institutions with the greatest flexibility in responding to the highly varied needs of the Joint Funds programs were regarded as the most effective. While institutional standards are critically important to any educational enterprise, the community college was founded on the basic premise that the educational needs of the community must be addressed through a wide variety of programs and delivery methods (Cohen & Brawer, 1989; Parnell, 1985). Units and offices working directly with the Joint Funds must be able to adjust within

reason to changing demands from industry for training programs and courses. Often this requires the ability to negotiate carefully the distinct needs and interests of management, union officials, and the individuals enrolled in the program. Programs and courses must be organized and delivered in a flexible, efficient, and effective manner. Many of the strategies developed by Henry Ford Community College's Office of Corporate Training under the auspices of a subcommittee of the College's Administrative Council were particularly effective in coordinating needed services ranging from bookstore support to on-site registration and basic skills assessment to processing of tuition assistance vouchers.

(2) In many instances, the staff directly involved in setting up Joint Funds programs initially had little or no formal preparation for the task. Community colleges and technical institutes must provide staff employed in these economic development/customized training centers with the appropriate faculty/staff development to assure that they are competent and knowledgeable in working with local unions and management officials in a skillful and diplomatic manner, assessing the training needs of the workforce through and with local plant committees, and managing relationships with instructional departments and instructors to ensure their effectiveness in the plant. Additionally, instructors who are assigned to work in the plant-based programs must be provided with specialized inservice training. Particularly important are skills in working with adults with varying levels of literacy.

(3) Colleges and institutes that undertake these innovative programs must adopt comprehensive and systematic data collection efforts to assure accountability. While some of the programs studied did collect instructor and course evaluation information from individuals completing the courses, none of the programs had been able to conduct long-term follow-up studies to ascertain the possible impact of the program upon employment, earnings, or involvement in further education or training. This evaluation data is particularly crucial for programs partially funded from public sources such as JTPA and Vocational Education funds. The relatively new provisions of the JTPA call for data indicating post-program outcomes and cost effectiveness measures for all programs, including on-the-job training. The recently reauthorized Vocational Education Act also requires performance standards for programs receiving federal support.

(4) Many of the Joint Funds programs reside in urban areas and serve populations which are ethnically and culturally diverse. In staffing in-plant programs where the employees come from non-English speaking households, it is critical that professional and paraprofessional staff be employed whose backgrounds match closely those of the employees. It is also important to utilize staff in these programs who can serve as effective role models for individuals who may lack basic literacy level competencies.

(5) Universities that operate undergraduate and graduate programs in vocational-technical education and adult education need to give more attention to the employment opportunities for adult and vocational educators in programs like the Joint Funds initiatives. Most of the colleges who participated in the study found it very difficult to recruit instructors, counselors, assessment personnel, or administrative staff who were appropriately trained at the university level. Working in collaboration with regional groups of colleges/institutes, universities should implement a series of inservice staff development programs to improve the expertise of professionals who are employed in these programs.

REFERENCES

American Association of Community and Junior Colleges/Association of Community College Trustees. (1986). *Annual Keeping America Working Partnership Awards.* Washington, DC: Author.

Blanchard, J. (1990, January). *Building the future: The Michigan Strategy* (A Report to the People of Michigan and the Legislature). Lansing, MI: Office of the Governor, State of Michigan.

Cohen, A. M., & Brawer, F. B. (1989). *The American community college* (2nd ed.). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Geber, B. (1989, April). The resurrection of Ford. *Training, 26,* 23-28.

Gordus, J. P., Gohrband, C., & Meiland, P. R. (1987). *Preventing obsolescence through retraining: Contexts, policies, and programs* (ERIC Information Series No. 322). Columbus: National Center for Research in Vocational Education, Ohio State University.

Grubb, W. N. (1990). Simple faiths, complex facts: Vocational education as an economic development strategy. In J. Schmandt & R. Wilson (Eds.), *Growth policy in the age of high technology: The role of regions and states* (pp. 254-280). Winchester, MA: Unwin Hyman Limited.

Katsinas, S. G., & Lacey, V. (1989). *Community colleges and economic development.* Washington, DC: American Association of Community and Junior Colleges.

Katz, H. C. (1986). *Shifting gears: Changing labor relations in the U.S. automobile industry.* Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Parnell, D. (1985). *The neglected majority.* Washington, DC: Community College Press.

Parnell, D. (1990, April). Cited in *Workforce Development Strategies, 1*(11), 5.

Robertson, D., & Wareham, J. (1987). *Technological change in the auto industry*. Toronto, Canada: CAW Technology Project.

UAW-Chrysler National Skill Development and Training Center. (1989). *Achieving goals . . . together*. Detroit, MI: Author.

UAW-Ford National Education, Development, and Training Center. (1988). *UAW-Ford joint programs*. Dearborn, MI: Author.

UAW-GM Human Resource Center. (n.d.). Selected brochures from the National Center in Auburn Hills, MI.